

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1- 17 are pending in this application, wherein claims 1, 13, 16-17 are amended to clarify the stencil-related features of the invention. No new matter is added.

Applicants gratefully appreciate the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative, Jonathan Kidney, during the Personal Interview conducted on November 5, 2007. Based on clarifying comments made during the Interview by Examiner Williams and Primary Examiner Yan, Applicants have accordingly amended the claims. Therefore, in view of the above amendments and following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-12 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, particularly independent claims 1 and 16. Applicants have amended the claims to obviate this rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this rejection.

#### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 4 – 8, 11 and 13 – 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103 over the Kubota (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0029703) Kanno (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0127001), further in view of Starr (U.S. Patent Application No. 5,305,238). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed upon in the Personal Interview, Applicants' claimed subject matter is not disclosed or suggested by these references. Also, as agreed upon in the Interview, there would be no motivation to combine the references. Therefore, Kubota, Kanno, and Starr, individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest all the features of Applicants' claimed subject matter.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this rejection.

The Office Action rejects claims 3, 9, 10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Kubota, Kanno, Starr, in view of Sato (U.S. Patent Application No. 6,401,606). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed upon in the Personal Interview, Sato does not supply the subject matter lacking in Kubota, Kanno, and Starr. Therefore, individually or in combination, the above references do not disclose or suggest all the features of Applicants' claimed subject matter.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this rejection.

### CONCLUSION


In light of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney if it is believed that such contact will expedite the prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

**NATH LAW GROUP PLLC**

November 8, 2007

NATH LAW GROUP PLLC  
112 South West Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314-2891  
Tel: 703-548-6284  
Fax: 703-683-8396



Gary M. Nath  
Registration No. 26,965  
Jerald L. Meyer  
Registration No. 41,194  
Jonathan A. Kidney  
Registration No. 46,195  
Customer No. 20529